

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 1)
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

DOCKETING STATEMENT

Case Number: 23-2035Short Case Caption: Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc.Filing Party/Entity: Rideshare Displays, Inc.

Instructions: Complete each section or check the box if a section is intentionally blank or not applicable. Attach additional pages as needed. Refer to the court's Mediation Guidelines for filing requirements. An amended docketing statement is required for each new appeal or cross-appeal consolidated after first filing.

Case Origin	Originating Number	Type of Case
USPTO PTAB	IPR2021-01600	Inter Partes Review

Relief sought on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Reversal of the PTAB holding of the unpatentability of all challenged claims.

Relief awarded below (if damages, specify): ☒ None/Not Applicable

Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from:

The PTAB held claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 10,395,525 as unpatentable.

Nature of judgment (select one):

Date of judgment: 4/10/23☒ Final Judgment, 28 USC § 1295☐ Rule 54(b)☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type) _____☐ Other (explain) _____

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 2)
July 2020

Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court, and the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. ☐ None/Not Applicable

23-2033 Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc.; 23-2034 Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc.; 23-2036 Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc.; 23-2037 Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc. 1:20-cv-01629 Rideshare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc.

Issues to be raised on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Unpatentability of challenged claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 10,395,525.

Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If "yes," when were the last such discussions?

- ☐ Before the case was filed below
☐ During the pendency of the case below
☐ Following the judgment/order appealed from

If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If they were mediated, by whom?

Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain.

Because the appeal involves the patentability of challenged claims, there is no settlement potential.

Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.

Date: 6/30/23 Signature: /Devan V. Padmanabhan/

Name: Devan V. Padmanabhan